REMARKS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Office Action dated May 27, 2009. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1-17 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Summary of Response

Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 14, and 16 are currently amended herein.

Claims 10, 12, 15, and 17 remain as originally submitted.

Claims 18-37 were previously canceled.

Claims 38-40 are new.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

Summary of Claims Pending

Claims 1-17 and 38-40 are currently pending following this response.

Response to Rejections

Knudson and Swanke do not provide an Enterprise Application Integration process that facilitates the integration of workflow management processes throughout an enterprise, or a software portal through which data related to a software development project can be gathered, displayed, managed, and disseminated. More particularly, Knudson and Swanke do not disclose, teach, or suggest use of a software portal that facilitates project development within an enterprise, whereby the portal includes provisions for directly notifying end users about project events as they occur, using email, or other messaging technologies. For example, Knudson and Swanke do not teach or suggest use of a software portal that can determine an end of a phase of the project development process, and upon completion of that phase, automatically sends a message to the personnel responsible for completing the next *phase* in the process and inform the personnel that the next *phase* can begin. Furthermore, neither Knudson nor Swanke teach or suggest use of a software portal that can *automatically* determine the start and end dates for the next phase in a project development process and automatically update a process schedule with the start and end dates for the next phase. Such features enable the portal to monitor the progress and also drive the activities of the project development process involved.

The pending application discloses a system and method for managing a project development process in an enterprise, and an Enterprise Development Process (EDP) portal or software tool that facilitates the integration of enterprise architectures. The EDP portal provides consistent checkpoints throughout a project development process that allow significant events in the process to occur in a predictable, scheduled manner. More particularly, the portal is a web-based software application that supports a process-based, activity-based management model of software development by providing an organization-wide, standardized means of collecting,

managing, and reporting on work flowing through the software development process. The portal enables all parties associated with a project to determine its status and allows information about a project to be documented from its inception. Thus, the disclosed EDP portal provides a common touch-point for collecting and managing project information, and a vehicle for collaboratively planning, managing, and executing a project and distributing up-to-date project information in real-time, without requiring additional post-processing or analysis.

Knudson is directed to a dynamic project management system that automatically tracks and controls project tasks in accordance with various project schedules. The project management system includes a server network and a master database. The network is configured to identify a personnel resource pool including users. The system uses a project planning tool to execute a project plan, which includes tasks to be performed by the users in accordance with certain time schedules. The network translates the project plan into the master database and generates an assignments table, including a list of project tasks that are assigned to be completed by each of the users. Time sheets are periodically prepared in the master database from the assignments table and include a list of the project tasks assigned to a respective user and a time period record for recording time entries. The system feeds the actual time expended in performing the tasks back to the project plan to allow completion of the tasks in accordance with the time schedules. Notably, although Knudson is directed to a dynamic project management system, Knudson does not teach or suggest a software portal or method for project development within an enterprise, which notifies an individual with responsibility for the next phase of a project development process, upon completion of the previous phase, by automatically sending a message to the individual informing the individual that the next phase can begin, as claimed. Furthermore, Knudson does not teach or suggest a software portal or method for project development that determines a start date and end

date for the next phase in the project development process, and automatically updates a schedule of the process with the start date and the end date for the next phase, as claimed.

Swanke is directed to a system and method for planning a design project, coordinating project resources and tools, and monitoring the project process. Swanke identifies tasks that must be finished to complete the design project based on design data, assigns tasks to a plurality of resources, and prioritizes the tasks based on dependency between the tasks to create a project plan. Swanke stores the project plan and the design data in a database, and automatically notifies the resources of corresponding task responsibilities and associated due dates based on the project plan through the use of encryption keys. Thus, Swanke controls access to the design data with the encryption keys assigned to the resources involved. Swanke also automatically monitors the work being performed on the tasks through a computerized network, and automatically notifies a project team leader of task completion status, overdue tasks, and tasks being ignored. Swanke further allows a user to enter various task information such as a start and end date for a task. However, Swanke does not teach or suggest a software portal or method for project development that automatically determines a start date and end date for the next phase in the project development process, as claimed, thereby reducing human error as well as inhibiting the deliberate entry of false information.

These distinctions, as well as others, will be discussed in greater detail in the analyses of the pending claims that follow.

Response to Rejections under Section 103

Claim 1:

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,765,140 ("Knudson") in view of Swanke, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,212,987 ("Swanke"), further in view of Turnbull, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,208,765 ("Turnbull").

I.   Knudson and Swanke do not teach or suggest automatically determining a start date and an end date for the next phase in the project development process, and automatically updating a schedule of the project development process with the start date and end date for the next phase.

Claim 1 (as currently amended) recites, in part, "automatically determining a start date and an end date for the next phase in the project development process, and automatically updating a schedule of the project development process with the start date and end date for the next phase." This amendment is respectfully submitted not to introduce any new matter. Support for this amendment may be found throughout the application as originally filed and at least in paragraph [0027].

The Office Action admits that Knudson does not explicitly teach "determining a start date and an end date for the next phase in the project development process, and automatically updating a schedule of the project development process with the start date and end date for the next phase" as recited in claim 1 of the pending application. However, the Office Action relies on column 5, lines 4-58 in Swanke to teach "determining a start date and an end date for the next phase in the project development process." Swanke, column 5, lines 5-11 states "when a task is **entered** in the project planner 142, the information entered includes the task, the person (resource) 115-118, the data source, and optional data destination, the design tools used 125, 126, for the task along with normal start, end and any task that may gate the start of the task, along with any task that may be

17

gated by this task." (emphases added). Thus, if and to the extent that Swanke discloses determining a start and end date for the next phase in the project development process, the start and end dates are entered by a user and are not **automatically** determined as required by claim 1 as currently amended. The pending application states that "[i]f changes occur in a project's schedule, the revised planned transition dates can be … generated automatically based on the typical lengths of time for transitions to occur." (See, Application, ¶ [0027]). Furthermore, automatically tracking dates and determining dates "limits the opportunities for users to manually enter transition dates and thus prevents errors and deliberate entry of false information." (See, Application, ¶ [0027]). However, Swanke does not recognize the importance of automatically determining start and end dates, but rather relies on user entry of these dates which, as the pending application recognizes, is susceptible to human error and deliberate falsification.

Turnbull was not relied upon by the Office Action with reference to the feature of "automatically determining a start date and an end date for the next phase in the project development process." Furthermore, Turnbull does not appear to teach or suggest automatically determining start and end dates. Consequently, Turnbull does not cure the deficiencies of Knudson in view of Swanke.

II.   Knudson and Swanke do not teach or suggest notifying at least one individual with responsibility for a next phase of the project development process, upon the completion of the previous phase within the project development process, by automatically sending a message to the at least one of the individuals with responsibility for the next phase in the project development process, the message informing the at least one individual that the next phase can begin.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "notifying at least one individual with responsibility for a next phase of the project development process, upon the completion of the previous phase within the

18

project development process, by automatically sending a message to the at least one of the

individuals with responsibility for the next phase in the project development process, the message

informing the at least one individual that the next phase can begin."

The Office Action admits that Knudson does not teach the above-recited elements of claim

1, but it asserts that Swanke cures the deficiencies of Knudson in that regard. However, Applicants

respectfully disagree with that assertion for the following reasons.

For example, the Office Action relied on the following disclosure in column 2, lines 1-38

of Swanke to read on the above-recited elements of claim 1:

> Next, the invention stores the project plan and the design data in a
> database. The invention automatically notifies the resources of
> corresponding task responsibilities and associated due dates based
> on the project plan through the use of encryption keys. The
> invention controls access to the design data through the use of the
> encryption keys assigned to the resources. The invention
> automatically monitors work being performed on the tasks through a
> computerized network and automatically notifies a project team
> leader of task completion status, overdue tasks, and tasks being
> ignored, based on the monitoring. The monitoring includes
> observing whether a resource is actively working on a task
> exclusively by observing network activity of the resource. The
> invention automatically schedules a meeting of all corresponding
> resources if a task becomes overdue. Further, the invention produces
> periodic status reports based on the monitoring. The invention
> automatically notifies the resources of additional tasks as
> prerequisite tasks are completed. The invention automatically
> searches for additional resources for tasks that are overdue. The
> monitoring process includes a polling function. With the invention,
> the project planner and database/tools 142, the design data 125, the
> designers 115 118, and the design tools 126 are fully integrated into
> a cohesive and pervasive whole 110. When being assigned a task,
> each user is provided with keys of that allow access to in the
> necessary tools. The keys allow the invention to track the progress
> of each task by utilizing the time parameters within each of the keys.
> Therefore, the invention controls access to the tools and assigns
> tasks through use of keys. The result is that the project planer 142 is
> fully integrated into the actual design tasks without the need of
> manual intervention. Changes in schedule can occur in a real time

> manner. Work completing early can be detected, and the next tasks launched and vice versa (the overdue task is visible). In addition, tasks being ignored are immediately flagged, and proper attention can be applied to the problem- In this manner, a higher probability of success can occur. (Underlining added for emphasis.)

As shown above, Swanke merely teaches automatically notifying <u>the resources that are performing the tasks</u> of additional tasks they are to perform. Notably, Swanke distinguishes between its resources that perform the tasks, and its <u>project team leader</u> who may correspond to the "individual with **responsibility for** a next phase of the project development process" (Bold added for emphasis), as required by claim 1. Note that Swanke does not disclose notifying a project team leader informing them that a resource can proceed with performing a subsequent task once a previous task is completed. Rather, as discussed above, Swanke simply notifies the resource directly. As such, as shown above, Swanke does not teach or suggest "automatically sending a message to the at least one of the individuals with responsibility for the next phase in the project development process [e.g., Swanke's project team leader], the message informing the at least one individual that the next phase can begin," as claimed. Further, Swanke merely teaches "automatically notifying the resources of additional tasks," but Swanke does not teach "<u>informing</u> the at least one individual <u>that the next phase can begin</u>," which is also required by claim 1.

Moreover, Swanke discloses "tasks" and not "phases." A "task" is not equivalent to a "phase." A task is a single piece of work. However, a phase comprises numerous tasks. For example, the pending application states that "[t]he Define phase typically comprises four steps, Intent, Ideation, Feasibility, and Estimation." (See, Application, ¶ [0017]). Each step comprises one or more tasks. Thus, a phase comprises multiple tasks – not a single task. Further, claim 1 explicitly recites, "…phase comprises a segment of the project development process that includes multiple tasks that are grouped together as related functional processes." However, Swanke

teaches a notifying step only in regards to completion of a task – not completion of a phase. Additionally, as noted above, the notifying step is notifying resources – not individuals.

While Turnbull was not relied upon by the Office Action with reference to the feature of "notifying at least one individual with responsibility for a next phase of the project development process," the Office Action did rely on Turnbull to provide teaching of a phase of a project development process. Specifically, the Office Action relied on the disclosure of Turnbull in column 5, lines 52-56 corresponding to stages of a segmentation corresponding to a phase of a product development. However, even if Turnbull did disclose phases of a product development, Turnbull does not automatically provide notification to a person with responsibility for a next phase of the project development process, as claimed. Consequently, Turnbull does not cure the deficiencies of Knudson in view of Swanke.

For at least the reasons established above in sections I and II, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Knudson in view of Swanke and further in view of Turnbull and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

Claims Depending from Claim 1:

Claims 2-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson in view of Swanke, further in view of Turnbull.

Dependent claims 2-7 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in sections I and II above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-7 are not taught or suggested by Knudson and respectfully request allowance of these claims. Swanke does not cure the deficiencies of Knudson.

Claim 8:

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson in view of Swanke, further in view of Turnbull.

Claim 8 includes limitations substantially similar to the limitations discussed in section I above and has been amended in a similar manner to claim 1. For example, claim 8 recites "automatically determining a start date and an end date for the next phase in the project development process." Accordingly, the arguments of sections I and II are hereby repeated for claim 8.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in sections I and II above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 8 is not taught or suggested by Knudson in view of Swanke and respectfully request allowance of this claim. Turnbull does not cure the deficiencies of Knudson in view of Swanke.

Claims Depending from Claim 8:

Claims 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson in view of Swanke, further in view of Turnbull.

Dependent claims 9-12 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 8 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in sections I and II above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-12 are not taught or suggested by Knudson and respectfully request allowance of these claims. Turnbull does not cure the deficiencies of Knudson in view of Swanke.

Claim 13:

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson in view of Swanke, further in view of Turnbull.

Claim 13 includes limitations substantially similar to the limitations discussed in sections I and II above and has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. For example, claim 13, as currently amended, recites "a second action in the management of the progress of the project automatically determines a start date and an end date for the next phase in the project development process." Accordingly, the arguments of section I are hereby repeated for claim 13.

For at least the reasons established in sections I and II above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 13 is not taught or suggested by Knudson in view of Swanke and respectfully request allowance of this claim. Turnbull does not cure the deficiencies of Knudson in view of Swanke.

Claims Depending from Claim 13:

Claims 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson in view of Swanke, further in view of Turnbull.

Dependent claims 14-17 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 13 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in sections I and II above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14-17 are not taught or suggested by Knudson in view of Swanke and respectfully request allowance of these claims. Turnbull does not cure the deficiencies of Knudson in view of Swanke.

New Claims 38-40:

Claims 38-40 each recite that "the start date and the end date for the next phase in the project development process is determined based at least in part on typical lengths of time for transitions to occur." This limitation is respectfully submitted not to introduce any new matter. Support for this limitation may be found throughout the application as originally filed and at least in paragraph [0027]. Applicants respectfully submit that this limitation is not taught or suggested by Knudson, Swanke, or Turnbull alone or in combination. Furthermore, claims 38-40 depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 13 respectively and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the reasons established in section I above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 38-40 are not taught or suggested by Knudson in view of Swanke and respectfully request allowance of these claims. Turnbull does not cure the deficiencies of Knudson in view of Swanke.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 26, 2009

/Michael W. Piper/
Michael W. Piper
Reg. No. 39,800

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5601 Granite Parkway, Suite 750
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

66397 v4/4000.12600